



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

has not indicated the relation of his results to those of such critics as Richter in his essay *Zur Dramaturgie des Aeschylus*. In what he says of the closing scene of the *Septem* (pp. 42 ff.) he displays no knowledge of the acute study of Wilamowitz in *Drei Schlusscenen griechischer Dramen* (*Sitzungsber. d. kön. preuss. Akad. d. Wiss.*, 1903, pp. 436 ff.). The inquiry of Mr. K. K. Smith into the use of the buskin is such as to compel assent to his conclusions, which may be stated in his own words:

We have found that this boot is first represented in art at the close of the second century B. C. and then appears as a symbol of tragedy, that it is first mentioned in literature of the Imperial period, and that its use in this period is certain. We can not be so positive with regard to the Hellenistic period, but the literature that we have knows no name for such a boot. For the fifth and fourth centuries we have more than a plausible argument against the use of such a boot. The literature of the period has no name for any special tragic boot; the drama is full of lively action which the six-inch and higher sole we are asked to believe in almost precludes; the art of the period never pictures it either as a symbol of tragedy with the mask or as the foot-wear of actors, and the most positive piece of evidence on either side of the question, the Piraeus Relief, represents actors with natural, ordinary boots.

W. A. HEIDEL

Brygos—His Characteristics. By OLIVER SAMUEL TONKS. Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, Vol. XIII, No. 2. Cambridge, 1904. Pp. 119 and two Plates.

This essay is in the main an attempt to determine the characteristics by which the vases of Brygos may be distinguished from those of other vase-painters. It is largely based, as any such study must be, upon the chapter devoted to Brygos in Hartwig's *Meisterschalen*, but it endeavors to correct and supplement Hartwig's discussion and to substitute for his somewhat immethodical procedure a rigorously methodical one.

Unfortunately Dr. Tonks has blundered egregiously in reporting Hartwig. He professes to extract from Hartwig's running comments on various vases a list of thirty-eight characteristics assigned by that authority to Brygos. The first is this: "*The meander is the double, interlocking variety.*" The truth is that Hartwig merely mentions (*Meisterschalen*, p. 309) that a meander of this form occurs on a cylix which he attributes to Brygos; that again and again he calls attention to other forms of meander on other cylices attributed to the same hand; and that in a final summary (p. 371) he emphasizes the manifold variety of Brygos' meander patterns. Again, the statement is fathered upon Hartwig that in Brygos' work "*figures reclining on couches are covered to the waist with the himation*" (p. 74; cf. p. 65). What Hartwig really speaks of is "*die Enthüllung der Figuren bis unter den Schoss,*" i. e., the

deliberate exposure of the *aïdoûa* (*Meisterschalen*, pp. 327, 350). Nor do these cases stand alone. A somewhat close scrutiny of Dr. Tonks's citations, not only from Hartwig, but from Furtwängler, Hauser, and Kretschmer, has revealed similar inaccuracies sown broadcast.

In studying actual vases—which is, of course, the main thing—Dr. Tonks has been more painstaking. I feel bound, however, to record my conviction that his method, in spite of its appearance of scientific rigor, is not only inadequate, but false. His fundamental assumption is that, if we can find on the signed vases of Brygos any trait, whether object, attitude, or mode of drawing, which does not occur on the work [this evidently ought to mean the *signed* work] of any other vase-painter, then such a trait is an infallible mark by which to identify the unsigned vases of Brygos. But when we reflect upon the small proportion of signed vases to unsigned ones, and also upon the ease with which some of these supposedly exclusive traits could have been imitated, we see that this assumption is anything but self-evident. Nor can I believe that this method of attacking the problem would lead to any satisfactory apportionment of vases among various hands.

If the characteristics assigned by Dr. Tonks exclusively to Brygos were really infallible tests of his handiwork, they would be valuable, no matter how far they might fall short of doing justice to that artist's merits. That they are not quite infallible may be seen in the case of the "long and narrow eyes of boys and girls." This test breaks down in reference to a cylix, No. 58 of Dr. Tonks's list, which Hauser has shown reason to deny to Brygos. But the chief comment to make is that Dr. Tonks's mechanical treatment omits what to an appreciative eye is most interesting and distinctive in the work of Brygos—an impetuous, dramatic quality which can not be adequately defined in words.

F. B. TARBELL

Cours d'épigraphie latine. Par RENÉ CAGNAT. *Supplément* à la troisième édition. Pp. 473–505. Paris, 1904.

This small brochure presents Addenda et Corrigenda to the author's third edition of his *Cours d'épigraphie latine*, published in 1898. The notes are nearly all short and are comparatively few in number. The longest one, occupying two pages, summarizes an article of Mommsen's on nicknames (*signa*). About 127 additions are made to the list of abbreviations, and a new *Table analytique* is prepared, which includes references also to the matter in the *Supplément*. In the bibliography the author has neglected to mention the important collection of Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*, Vol. II, Pars I, and the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae epigraphicae: A Dictionary of the Latin Inscriptions*, in course of preparation by George N. Olcott.

WALTER DENNISON